

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume VIII, Issue No. VIII

February 2003

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

Defending the Homeland

By Chris Weinkopf

"LET ME TELL YOU, AS A COP, I'm not gonna be there [in time]," Mark Granko, a former SWAT team officer and 25 year police veteran, told his students. "I don't care if you call 911. By the time we get there, it's over."

That's why the 15 men, mostly in their 20s and 30s, had trekked to the seedy Oakland suburb of Richmond for one purpose alone: to learn how to kill an attacker instead of allowing him to kill us while we wait for the police to arrive.

After all, our targets were never more than seven feet away, just like real-life rapists, murderers, muggers—and possibly terrorists. As our coaches liked to remind us, a sloppy shot could make the difference between our own life and death.

That was the heart of the two-day class: life and death. ***The question was whether each of us, if tested, valued our lives and those of our family and loved ones enough to fight for them, or whether we would accept victimization.***

In 1993, Jeffrey Snyder wrote a seminal piece for *The Public Interest*, "A Nation of Cowards," in which he marveled at an odd contradiction in American culture—our collective, professed commitment to independence and autonomy, yet our utter refusal to accept, individually, the responsibility for protecting ourselves from crime. "While people are encouraged to revel in their individuality and incalculable self-worth," Snyder wrote, "the media and the law enforcement establishment continually advise us that, when confronted with the threat of lethal violence, we should not resist, but simply give the attacker what he wants."

This mentality assumes that the attacker—who has already broken both the law and our first social contract to respect the property rights, freedom, and dignity of others—will suddenly abide by a new social contract, one Snyder characterized as, "I will not hurt or kill you if you give me what I want." At times that may be the case, but often, it isn't.

There's also the greater point of our duty to our fellow civilized, law-abiding man. It's one thing to forfeit one's own life, property, or dignity to an assailant, and quite another to submit one's neighbor or loved one to the same. Where is the virtue in a husband who, honoring some imaginary social contract with a criminal, allows his wife to be raped? Or the parents who stand by helpless as an intruder carries off their child?

How about the citizen who quivers behind a potted plant as a terrorist unloads his rifle into a crowded theater? The war on terror adds a new dimension to the case Snyder laid out a decade ago. ***Today, self-defense entails not only protecting one's self, but also one's nation and its security.***

Snyder wrote convincingly of each person's moral responsibility to take up arms in self-defense: ***"Crime is rampant because the law-abiding, each of us, condone it, excuse it, permit it, submit to it. We permit and encourage it because we do not fight back, immediately, then and there, where it happens.... We are a nation of cowards and shirkers."***

Nearly a decade later, the dichotomy between our fetish of self-sufficiency and our aversion to self-defense is greater than ever. As a culture, we have increasingly come to realize that each of us can perform

many of the tasks we once consigned largely to "experts," whether it's refinishing the hardwood floors or filing our taxes. Yet when it comes to confronting rapists, murderers, robbers, or terrorists, that's a duty most of us—especially those living in the "blue states" [that vote liberal Democrat]—would just as soon leave to the professionals, even though the professionals are usually the first to admit that in most situations, there's little or nothing they can do.

I'm a product of the culture of cowardice. I grew up in New England, where guns were considered the playthings of sociopaths and rednecks, with no place in the home of thoughtful, civilized people. I've lived in blue-state territory all my life, from New England to New York, to my current home in Southern California. In these parts, even among Republicans and conservatives, there's a stigma attached to gun ownership, as if the commitment to individual responsibility stops short of self-defense.

When I told my friends and relatives that I was taking an intensive gun-training class the response was either one of disdain or bemusement. I repeatedly found myself offering an explanation—"It's for an article I'm writing"—as though a professional interest in self-defense was more legitimate than a personal one.

I had come to understand the societal value of gun ownership, and I was a supporter of the Second Amendment. But guns were still for other people.

My pro-gun convictions became more personal after 9/11. So when Ed Isper, then the president of Civil Shield, a company specializing in both armed and unarmed self-defense

training of all kinds, invited me to participate in a weekend-long class in pistol techniques, I eagerly accepted the offer.

The classes, which cost \$350 apiece plus nearly as much in ammunition, drew a largely upper-middle-class clientele. It was a serious group, with few if any showboaters, survivalists, or overly macho types. The experience levels ranged from novices to a Berkeley cop, there to supplement his professional training.

Except for the dance classes my wife and I took, I had never felt so instantly incompetent. Each time, as we were called to draw and fire our weapons within a matter of seconds, I found myself stumbling to be mindful of my motion, my stance, my grip, my aim, how my eyes would move to the target, the way my finger gently squeezed the trigger until—pow!—the sudden burst jerked the whole upper half of my body backward.

But I learned how to do a “combat reload,” and how to set up shots on the move by reacting to motions and sounds around me. I learned how to fire from one knee for close-quarters situations, and, when the circumstances demand it, how to perform a “failure drill”—two shots to the chest, one to the head.

By the end of the first day, I was holding my own. At the end of the second, I had the calluses, blisters, and bruises to show for firing off literally hundreds of rounds of ammunition. I was smooth on the draw—albeit far from quick—and when I managed to remember all the pointers my instructors had given me, I was a pretty decent shot. In one of our last exercises, when, instead of firing at black-and-white outlines of human shapes, we got to shoot up life-size posters of fictional assailants, I managed to put a bullet smack in the forehead of the Uzi-packing bad guy. I couldn't help feeling a certain sense of self-satisfaction when the instructor offered a one-word assessment: “Vicious.”

But underlying the thrill of the moment was the sobering reality that in real life my targets wouldn't be made of paper, nor would they wait the several seconds it took me to get in my stance and aim. A lot more practice would be necessary. Still, the foundation had been laid, and my incompetence transformed to a basic confidence: Victimhood is a choice I need not make.

Ed Isper, Civil Shield's former president, believes that September 11, 2001, “caused a lot of people to step

back and re-evaluate their opinion on the use of violence in self-defense. People...are much less inclined to accept being terrorized.”

Indeed, if ever there was a crystallizing event to prove the inability of government to prevent, let alone stop, all acts of evil, it was that day. The combined, bungling efforts of myriad federal law enforcement agencies proved inadequate to quash the murderous aspirations of 19 ruthless terrorists. Metal detectors, x-ray machines, and the perfunctory “have your bags been with you at all times” interrogation at the ticket counter didn't stop the men from bringing boxcutters on board. Even the Air Force effort to scramble fighter jets with orders to shoot the airliners down wasn't enough.

The terrorists did meet one setback that day: It was aboard United Flight 93, where ordinary people—not experts, not police, not federal sky marshals—who, thanks to their cell phones, soon realized that this was no “normal” hijacking. And so the brave souls on Flight 93, using the mantra “Let's roll” stopped the terrorists cold.

After September 11, when Richard Reid, who boarded a plane with plastic explosives encased in the sole of his sneaker, tried to ignite his shoe a swarm of passengers pinned him down and tied him up with their belts and neckties.

One of the great lessons of the first year of the war on terror is that homeland security necessarily begins at home. It's not enough for us to expect our government to stop every act of terrorism. We all must be willing to do our part.

On airplanes, doing our part is limited to hand-to-hand combat. But while hand-to-hand combat stopped Richard Reid and the murderers on Flight 93, sometimes nothing less than a gun will do.

Because of increased airport security terrorists will most likely shift their attacks elsewhere—supermarkets, amusement parks, sporting events. Because it's unclear where or how terrorists will strike next, it's also virtually impossible for the government to develop the appropriate safeguards for any potential attack.

What is clear is that the terrorists' efforts will be considerably more difficult if they are met with resistance from their intended victims. If that resistance is armed and well-trained, their efforts will be complicated all the more. And if they had good reason to fear such resistance almost

anywhere they might strike, their ambitions would be severely dampened.

Our world has changed over the last year, and with it our moral responsibility to defend ourselves. ***Effective homeland security is not a political abstraction, but an individual duty—a duty to be alert, to be prepared to strike back, and to be willing to do so when called. Cowardice can no longer be an option.***

-- www.taemag.com/taejf03b.pdf

Front Sight Firearms Training

Owning and using guns is your RIGHT. Being good at it is your RESPONSIBILITY. Want to be good at it? Check this out: <http://www.FrontSight.com/ArmedCitizensCorps.php?fsaid=coa>

“Just a Courtesy”

In the ongoing effort to keep public places clear of intoxicated citizens and drunk drivers, some police agencies are going directly into bars and restaurants in order to make arrests.

Such is the situation in northern Virginia, where Fairfax County Police are targeting patrons suspected of having one too many.

“[Officers] were talking to one of the guests, then physically pulled him off the barstool,” Richie Prisco, general manager at Champps bar told the *Reston Times*. “They were really aggressive and nasty.”

According to the report, police are hauling customers outside of establishments to conduct sobriety tests, then arresting them for public drunkenness should they fail.

Tavern owner Jimmy Cirrito says it was intimidating and unnecessary to have some ten officers show up in SWAT-like attire. He notes police seemed to be tagging people at random, despite their telling bar owners they had undercover agents inside, calling in to provide specific descriptions of certain individuals.

“They tapped one lady on the shoulder -- who was on her first drink and had just eaten dinner -- to take her out on the sidewalk and give her a sobriety test,” Cirrito told the paper.

“They made her count backward, say the alphabet, tell them where she lived, how she got there, how she was getting home,” he said. “She had just gotten there five minutes ago in a cab.”

Authorities say such methods are not new, despite protests from bar owners that they've never heard of

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. – Mark Twain

police coming inside their establishments to enforce drinking laws.

"I've been an officer for over 17 years, and we've been doing it on and off over my entire career," police spokeswoman Sophia Grinnan <<mailto:chief@fairfaxcounty.gov>> told the *Times*. "As much as officers hate to spoil a good time, they hate even more to go out at 2 a.m. and work a death of anybody that is alcohol-related."

Virginia statutes say any business with a liquor license is considered a public place; therefore, police are allowed free access. If they find someone over the legal alcohol limit of .08, or suspect a customer of being intoxicated while still being served or present in an establishment, police can issue a ticket for public intoxication.

In response to complaints the raids were overly aggressive, Grinnan said, "I've had bar owners come up to me [and] ask what is going on, but I've also had some approach me aggressively, telling me I couldn't be there and I was violating their constitutional rights. We love to give explanations of what we're doing because it has an impact, but officers don't have to give up their game plan. That is just a courtesy."

-- *WorldNetDaily.com*, Jan. 2003

Worshipping at the altar of the gun control lobby?

Madonna may be having second thoughts about an activity that she and spouse/director Guy Ritchie have enjoyed.

Both are bird hunters. But they're also followers of the Kabbala, a mystical Jewish belief system. *Women's Wear Daily*, which apparently covers more than just what women wear, reports that Kabbala teachers have been trying to scare Madonna and Guy out of their firearms.

Spiritual guides have told Madonna that, if the hunting continues, the souls of thousands of game birds will return and haunt them.

Now there's buzz that Guy's growing impatient because Madonna wants him to lay down his arms. So says the *New York Daily News*.

"The Left Coast Report" wonders if some Kabbala followers worship at the altar of the gun control lobby.

-- "The Left Coast Report" by James Hirszen, *NewsMax*, January 7, 2003

A "Living" Constitution Is A Dying Constitution

By Allan C. Stover

In an interview with Jim Lehrer at PBS Online before the Presidential election, Al Gore summed up his view of our Constitution: "You know, I believe the Constitution is a living and breathing document and that there are liberties found in the Constitution such as the right to privacy that spring from the document, itself, even though the Founders didn't write specific words saying this, this, and this. . . ."

The dangers of disregarding the Founders' intent become obvious in conflicting court rulings. The 5th U. S. Circuit Court recently ruled that the Second Amendment gives citizens a right "to privately possess and bear their own firearms." The 9th Circuit Court (aka 9th Circuit Court) in California ruled just the opposite a few weeks later, insisting that a "living" Constitution doesn't give individuals a right to bear arms.

In his classic article "A 'living' Constitution?" Cal Thomas wrote that Gore's view of the Constitution, shared by most political liberals, is one of the most dangerous philosophies of our time. It establishes a class of philosopher-kings who determine the rights of the people and shreds the Constitution as a document based on unchanging principles that promote the individual's own and the general welfare.

On the subject of the Constitution and its interpretation Thomas Jefferson wrote, "In questions of power.... let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution." -- Kentucky Resolutions 1798

Toward the end of his life Jefferson further elaborated: "On every question of construction [of the constitution] let us carry ourselves back to the time when the Constitution was adopted, recollect the spirit manifested in the debates, and instead of trying what meaning may be squeezed out of the text, or invented against it, conform to the probable one in which it was passed." --Jefferson, letter to William Johnson, June 12, 1823

"A 'living' Constitution," notes constitutional attorney John Whitehead, "means the Constitution is 'up for grabs,' and it becomes whatever the justices decide, not the people through their elected representatives."

In a review for the Delaware State Bar Association, distinguished attorney Richard A. Forsten wrote: "To allow or provide for an interpretative strategy which would

allow the meaning of the Constitution to change over time would mean that the law could change without the people's consent. Madison himself expressed the view that such could not be the case; and, indeed, to allow the meaning to change over time would subvert one of the very purposes for adopting a written constitution."

In a different vein Samuel Adams said: "It does not take a majority to prevail ... rather an irate, tireless minority, keen on setting brushfires of freedom in the minds of men."

Unless good Americans intervene to protect our Constitution, the America-hating leftists will prevail. They're already winning in the 9th Circuit's Left Coast jurisdiction. We must become Samuel Adams' "irate, tireless minority" and fight back against those who would rip up our beloved Constitution. Otherwise, the tyrants will use a "living and breathing" Constitution to take away our rights and freedoms. All of them.

The New World Order

By Bush I (George Herbert Walker Bush)

"Out of these troubled times, our fifth objective - a new world order - can emerge.. We are now in sight of a United Nations that performs as envisioned by its founders." -- Sept. 11, 1990 televised address

"I think that what's at stake here is the new world order. What's at stake here is whether we can have disputes peacefully resolved in the future by a reinvigorated United Nations." -- Jan. 7, 1991 interview in *U.S. News & World Report*

"I hope history will record that the Gulf crisis was the crucible of the new world order." -- August 1991 *National Security Strategy of the United States* signed by George Bush

N.J. Bill Requires Repair Shops To 'Fingerprint' Guns

New Jersey has already enacted the nation's first "smart gun" law. Now the gun-control debate has shifted to ballistics fingerprinting and legislation that would require repair shops to install these markings on firearms.

The bill's sponsor, Assemblywoman Loretta Weinberg (D-Bergen), said it is part of a much broader ballistics fingerprinting initiative that has already passed the Democrat-controlled Assembly and is awaiting action from the evenly split Senate.

Weinberg's bill is still in committee, but she called it a crucial component to state's gun-control efforts.

"This bill was designed to answer those naysayers who say you can't do ballistics fingerprinting because criminals can make changes to obfuscate those markings," she said. "We're now saying it's illegal to make changes."

But Second Amendment supporters in New Jersey and across the country pointed to other states' attempts at ballistics fingerprinting as evidence that it does not work.

Gun Owners of America, which has lobbied against fingerprinting, claims no crimes have been solved as a result of the technology in either Maryland or New York, the two states that have already implemented it.

Maryland has recorded about 17,000 shell casings since the law took effect in October 2000, while New York has taken more than 29,000 ballistic fingerprints, according to the group. Neither state has convicted anyone based on the technology, said Erich Pratt, the group's spokesman.

"This is a registration scheme and that's unconstitutional and very dangerous," Pratt said. "Registration has been used in this country in places like New York City to help police confiscate firearms from law-abiding gun owners. This would be a very disastrous direction for New Jersey to take."

National Rifle Association spokesman Ted Novin agreed that Weinberg's bill would amount to an expensive registration scheme. He said it might ultimately drive gun owners out of the state to have their firearms repaired.

The "smart gun" law that was signed by Democrat Gov. James E. McGreevey last month requires new handguns to be equipped with a device that only allows the gun's owner to fire it. The technology has not yet been developed, and the law will not take effect until three years after a handgun with the technology is released for sale.

Nancy Ross, spokeswoman for the Association of New Jersey Rifle and Pistol Clubs, said that victory has given gun-control advocates momentum to introduce new measures. She doubted that Weinberg's bill would have much success in the Legislature.

"This is a ridiculous requirement on law-abiding citizens and a restriction that will hurt ordinary people," Ross said. "The whole debate on these issues has nothing to do with

safety. It has to do with an ideological political agenda that poisons any discussion about making people safe or ending violence."

Gun Control Battle Joined on 'Cosmetic' Rifle Ban

By Jeff Johnson

The Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence, formerly known as Handgun Control, Inc., is lobbying Congress to extend the so-called "assault weapons ban" set to expire in September 2004.

Gun Owners of America Executive Director Larry Pratt said the ban could be renewed just prior to the 2004 elections. "I'm concerned that the Senate would reenact the measure," he cautioned. "It is Republican, but it's not a pro-gun majority."

"I think we have enough votes [in the House] that we can probably stop it," Pratt explained. "The best of both worlds would be that the Senate votes on it win, lose or draw. We kill it in the House, and then we go and clobber a bunch of senators in the next election."

The ban became law on September 13, 1994 as part of the "Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994."

The law mentioned nothing about true assault weapons, which are select-fire guns capable of being fired in semi-automatic or fully-automatic "machine gun" mode.

The legislation prohibited the domestic manufacture of hundreds of semi-automatic firearms with two or more military-style cosmetic features, such as a bayonet lug or a pistol grip, if such a gun is capable of accepting an ammunition magazine holding more than 10 rounds. Manufacturing new shotguns capable of holding six or more rounds of ammunition was also banned.

Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), claimed at the time that the law would restrict only 19 types of firearms. But the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms admitted in a Dec. 20, 1993 letter to Sen. Larry Craig (R-Idaho) that the law proposed to ban at least 45 types of guns.

Pratt recalled the lack of statistical support for the ban. "At the time of the ban, these guns were used in fewer murders than hands and feet," he said, citing nationwide statistics from the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports.

Those same reports also show that more law enforcement officers are murdered with their own service weapons each year than with

all types of semi-automatic rifles and shotguns combined.

Less than four percent of all guns used by criminals during the commission of a crime could be covered by even liberal interpretations of the definitions, according to a U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics report issued in Nov. 2001.

Second Amendment supporters feared when the Feinstein legislation was introduced that the list of banned weapons and accessories would continue to grow as gun control advocates expanded their reach.

Many shotguns, for example, only hold five rounds of standard two-and-three-quarter-inch or three-inch shells.

However, if two-inch British "short shells" are loaded, the shotguns can hold six rounds and are illegal to manufacture in the U.S.

While gun control advocates dismissed the possibility of such "stretches" of the law, some have already occurred at the state level.

In New Jersey, for example, state law bans any gun holding more than 15 rounds, meaning the tube-fed Remington 552 target rifle, which holds 15 .22-caliber "Long Rifle" rounds is an "assault weapon," banned under the state law.

The justification for that ban is that the tube can accept a total of 20 rounds of .22-caliber "Short" ammunition, typically used only in handguns.

-- CNSNews.com November 18, 2002

You Are a Suspect

By William Safire

If the Homeland Security Act is not amended before passage, here is what will happen to you:

Every purchase you make with a credit card, every magazine subscription you buy and medical prescription you fill, every Web site you visit and e-mail you send or receive, every academic grade you receive, every bank deposit you make, every trip you book and every event you attend - all these transactions and communications will go into what the Defense Department describes as "a virtual, centralized grand database."

To this computerized dossier on your private life from commercial sources, add every piece of information that government has about you - passport application, driver's license and bridge toll records, judicial and divorce records, complaints from nosy neighbors to the F.B.I., your

lifetime paper trail plus the latest hidden camera surveillance - and you have the supersnoop's dream: a "Total Information Awareness" about every U.S. citizen.

This is not some far-out Orwellian scenario. It is what will happen to your personal freedom in the next few weeks if John Poindexter gets the unprecedented power he seeks.

Remember Poindexter? Brilliant man, first in his class at the Naval Academy, later earned a doctorate in physics, rose to national security adviser under President Ronald Reagan. He had this brilliant idea of secretly selling missiles to Iran to pay ransom for hostages, and with the illicit proceeds to illegally support contras in Nicaragua.

A jury convicted Poindexter in 1990 on five felony counts of misleading Congress and making false statements, but an appeals court overturned the verdict because Congress had given him immunity for his testimony. He famously asserted, "The buck stops here," arguing that the White House staff, and not the president, was responsible for fateful decisions that might prove embarrassing.

This ring-knocking master of deceit is back again with a plan even more scandalous than Iran-contra. He heads the "Information Awareness Office" in the otherwise excellent Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, which spawned the Internet and stealth aircraft technology. Poindexter is now realizing his 20-year dream: getting the "data-mining" power to snoop on every public and private act of every American.

Even the hastily passed U.S.A. Patriot Act, which widened the scope of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act and weakened 15 privacy laws, raised requirements for the government to report secret eavesdropping to Congress and the courts. But Poindexter's assault on individual privacy rides roughshod over such oversight.

He is determined to break down the wall between commercial snooping and secret government intrusion. The disgraced admiral dismisses such necessary differentiation as bureaucratic "stovepiping." And he has been given a \$200 million budget to create computer dossiers on 300 million Americans.

When George W. Bush was running for president, he stood foursquare in defense of each person's medical, financial and communications privacy. But Poindexter, whose

contempt for the restraints of oversight drew the Reagan administration into its most serious blunder, is still operating on the presumption that on such a sweeping theft of privacy rights, the buck ends with him and not with the president.

This time, however, he has been seizing power in the open. In the past week John Markoff of *The Times*, followed by Robert O'Harrow of *The Washington Post*, have revealed the extent of Poindexter's operation, but editorialists have not grasped its undermining of the Freedom of Information Act.

Political awareness can overcome "Total Information Awareness," the combined force of commercial and government snooping. In a similar overreach, Attorney General Ashcroft tried his Terrorism Information and Prevention System (TIPS), but public outrage at the use of gossips and postal workers as snoops caused the House to shoot it down. The Senate should now do the same to this other exploitation of fear.

The Latin motto over Poindexter's new Pentagon office reads "Scientia Est Potentia" - "knowledge is power." Exactly: the government's infinite knowledge about you is its power over you. "We're just as concerned as the next person with protecting privacy," this brilliant mind blandly assured *The Post*. A jury found he spoke falsely before.

-- New York *Times* November 14, 2002

Letter to the Pinelands Commission

Pinelands Commission
P.O. Box 7
New Lisbon, New Jersey 08604

Mr. Chairman of the Pinelands Comm.,

As a member of the Texas Committee of Safety, which is working in unison with the New Jersey Committee of Safety [www.committee.org], we are convinced that the Pinelands Commission has violated the contracts of both State and Federal Constitutions. These contracts I might add were developed by the people to chain down the government and guard against any type of violation that would disrupt the tranquil conduct of the people.

The un-American activities of the Pinelands Commission have breached our contracts, which are the laws of our land. In doing so it has eroded Article 1, Section 1 of the State of New Jersey's Constitution which

states, "All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness." And let us remind this Commission that the violation of property rights disrupts life in general, for it destroys individuality.

Would this Commission please explain as to where they have assumed the authority to terminate the people's Constitutions, both State and Federal.

Time is the witness. This Commission is a violent aggressor against property rights, which are protected in our Bill of Rights, which was intended to be another safeguard against tyranny as suggested in its preamble. Sad to day, it has become null and void -- Would it be correct to suggest that this Commission and its cohorts are a cohort of an international body?

If the people were truly free and held property in allodium, how is it possible for anyone or any organization to deprive them of their natural rights? Ostensibly what we went to fight against in all the wars of the last century -- socialism -- we now find forced upon us. If this statement is not accurate, how does this Commission justify its existence.

This Commission and its cohorts along with this entire socialistic system are comparable to the one that the mighty ruler of the universe came to visit over 2000 years ago to set us free from despots. Likewise, it is indeed comparable to that system which our forefathers went into violent revolt against.

Let it be known that we Americans are striving to dissolve this hateful Commission.

We are anticipating your reply.

AAA

Ed.: there's no way we'll divulge the identity of this American patriot. We can almost sense ADL stooge Mark Pitcavage seething in frustration because he can't pass his name on to some misinformed SWAT team on "go" pills.

The Unarmed Bobby

Q: The fact that English police were not armed for many years has been used by gun control advocates as an argument against the private ownership of guns. But there's more to the story isn't there?

A: Let me explain that. What the gun control advocates now like to believe is that if the police are not armed and individuals [the people] are not armed then criminals will feel that they need not be armed.

But the real reason the police in England were not armed is that when they established a national police force in the 19th century, they were very unpopular: people did not like the idea of an armed group of men acting like a police or army around them. So they insisted that the police not be armed.

They never would have tolerated the establishment of a police force if the police were armed. So all the new police could carry would be a truncheon. But the people had firearms. It worked quite well for a very long time [from 1829 until the ban on handguns in the Firearms Act of 1997].

-- Interview by talk show host Tom Valentine of Joyce Lee Malcolm, professor of English history at Bentley College and author of *Guns and Violence: The English Experience*

Even a Maggot is Somebody's Child

By Kay T. Didd, Chairperson, PETI

This year 329.5 trillion of our multilegged, exoskeletoned brothers and sisters will end their days ricocheting off windshields, doing deep knee bends on flypaper, or getting zapped into blue-light popcorn on countless back porches of doom. Imagine the look of terror that must fill their little compound eyes in those horrifying moments before a rolled-up newspaper turns them into Rorschach blots! Imagine how their entire metamorphosis -- from egg to larva to pupa to adult -- must flash before them when they realize that a heel from hell is about to stomp them into the linoleum!

IT DOESN'T STOP THERE!

When not being squashed, smeared or sprayed our crawling cousins are callously kept from the bounty of our tables by screen doors and citronella candles. *Why? Why?*

How much of your pork chop could a blowfly eat?

This madness must end! America, it's time to stand up for the "little people" and say, "ENOUGH! STOP THE CARNAGE! START THE HEALING!"

Join us in our fight for legislation that will:

* Outlaw private ownership of door or window screen with mesh too small to allow the passage of an average size yam

* Establish a 72 hour "cooling off" period for all purchasers of repellents, headnets and swatters

* Provide tax incentives to restaurants with flies so thick that salad bar patrons can't tell the three bean blend from the blue cheese crumble

* Make weevils, roaches, ticks, chiggers, blowflies, fire ants, moths, locusts and silver fish National Treasures

* Mandate a "3 strikes and you're out" policy: Flatten any three National Treasures and you get 10 years without parole.

Join us today! Together we can win!

PETI, People for the Ethical

Treatment of Insects

-- *Survivor*, December 2002

Why We Need the Militia

In 1998 a U.S. House committee chaired by Rep. Christopher Cox found that China "has stolen classified design information on the United States' most advanced thermonuclear weapons. These thefts of nuclear secrets from our national weapons laboratories enabled the PRC to design, develop, and successfully test modern strategic nuclear weapons sooner than would otherwise have been possible. The stolen U.S. nuclear secrets give the PRC design information on thermonuclear weapons on a par with our own."

Notra Trulock exposed this scandal when he was Director of Intelligence at the Department of Energy. His book titled, *Code Name Kindred Spirit*, has just been published. It's a real page turner. It reveals the lax security at Los Alamos that enabled

one of its scientists, Wen Ho Lee, to download highly classified nuclear secrets onto insecure computers and copy them onto tapes. It also exposes the lax attitude of the CIA, FBI and others in the Clinton administration that made it impossible to staunch the flow of nuclear weapons secrets, missile technology and supercomputers to China.

Publishers Weekly says Trulock "provides a unique look into the American intelligence community and an unsettling perspective on the lax attitude toward national security. Wen Ho Lee's defensive memoir grabbed plenty of headlines, but Trulock's account has a disturbing ring of truth." Trulock shows how a reporter for the *Washington Post* who was very close to Bill and Hillary Clinton, went after him personally, hindering the investigation and helping make him the scapegoat. Trulock writes, "I don't know if Lee ... gave the PRC our nuclear secrets. I do know that he was a walking security nightmare who violated nearly every security rule in existence at Los Alamos National Laboratory."

-- *Media Monitor*

Ed.: it's clear the government doesn't care about the country. The CIA and FBI (to name only two) care only about themselves. When push comes to shove who besides the militia will stand in the gap?

* * *

"...no people ever yet groaned under the heavy yoke of slavery, but when they deserv'd it. ...The truth is, all might be free if they valued freedom, and defended it as they ought. ...If therefore a people will not be free; if they have not virtue enough to maintain their liberty against a presumptuous invader, they deserve no pity, and are to be treated with contempt and ignominy."

--Samuel Adams

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

militia264@aol.com

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Wake Co, NC, Dave (919) 363-9410

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone () _____ E-mail _____